REMARKS

Applicants have amended Claims 1, 17, 21, and 26 and canceled Claims 6, 22, and 30 and therefore, Claims 1-5, 7-21, and 23-29 are pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of the application.

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) for not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, "the first circuit comprising three buffers" was cited as not being shown. Applicants respectfully disagree and, for example, refer to Figs. 8-10 and the corresponding text. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Claims 5-8, 12, 22, and 30 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but Examiner indicated that the claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have rewritten Claims 1, 21, and 26 to include the limitations of their respective dependent claims (Claims 6, 22, and 30, respectively), as suggested by Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 21, and 26 along with their corresponding claims are in proper form for allowance.

Law Offices of Macpherson rivok Chen & Heid Llp

2402 Michelson Drive 3U17E 210 Irrinc, CA 92612 (949) 752-7040 FAX (049) 752-7049

-10- Serial No. 10/629,223

Accordingly, the following remarks regarding distinctions over the prior art do not apply to the just-described claims.

Claims 1-4, 9-11, 17-21, 24, and 26-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,622,208 to North [herein referred to as "North"] in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,741,846 to Welland et al. [herein referred to as "Welland"].

Claims 1, 21, and 26 are in proper form for allowance, based on the discussion above. Furthermore, Applicants have amended Claim 17 to recite "receiving a feedback signal selected from an internal feedback signal and an external feedback signal" which the Examiner indicated was an allowable limitation and not taught or suggested by North and Welland.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 17, 21, and 26 patentably distinguish over North in view of Welland and that corresponding dependent Claims 2-4, 9-11, 18-20, 24, and 26-29 are also distinguishable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 1-4, 9-11, 17-21, 24, and 26-29 be withdrawn.

LAW OFFICES OF MACPHERSON KWOK CHEN & HEM LLP

2402 Michelma Drive SUITE 210 Irvine, CA 02612 (949) 752-7040 PAX (949) 753-7049 Claims 21, 23, 25, 26, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No.

6,690,224 to Moore [herein referred to as "Moore"] in view of Welland.

Claims 21 and 26 are in proper form for allowance, based on the discussion above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 21 and 26 patentably distinguish over Moore in view of Welland and that corresponding dependent Claims 23, 25, and 28 are also distinguishable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 21, 23, 25, 26, and 28 be withdrawn.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-5, 7-21, and 23-29 are in proper form for allowance.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested and a timely Notice of Allowance is solicited.

If there are any questions regarding any aspect of the application, please call the undersigned at (949) 752-7040.

Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being faceimile transmitted to the .
Commissioner for Patents, Pax No. 571-273-8300, on the date stated below.

J. Ha. K. C. J.

August 18, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Greg J. Michelson

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 44,940

Law offices of Machierson Kwok Crisn & Heid LLP

2403 Michelson Drive SUITE 210 Irvine, CA 92612 (949) 752-7040 FAX (949) 753-7049